

ay



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/077,257 | 02/14/2002 | Douglas M. Crockett | 020196 | 3308 |

23696 7590 07/18/2005

Qualcomm Incorporated
Patents Department
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, CA 92121-1714

EXAMINER

TRINH, TAN H

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
|----------|--------------|

2684

DATE MAILED: 07/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. 10/077,257 | Applicant(s) CROCKETT ET AL. | |
| | Examiner TAN TRINH | Art Unit 2684 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 March 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-11,14-21,24-31 and 34-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-11,14-21,24-31 and 34-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 April 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1, 6-7, 11, 16-17, 21, 26-27, 31 and 36-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Aravamudan (U.S. Pub. No. 20030148779).

Regarding claims 1, 11, 21 and 31, Aravamudan teaches in a communication device (see fig. 1), a method for initiating a group call in a group communication network (see fig. 2) comprising: receiving a member list from a user (see page 7, section [0085]), sending a request to a server to initiate the group call base on the received member list (see page 7, section [0085], and figs. 2, 6 and fig. 20, page 8, sections [0093-0096 and 0099-0100]); receiving a response from the server indicating that the initiating the group call is in progress (see fig. 12, and page 8, section [0092-0094]) , and alerting the user to provide media and buffering the media for transmission after a traffic channel is re-established (see page 3, section [0024] and page 2, section [0019] and page 8, section [0095]).

Regarding claims 6, 16, 26 and 36, Aravamudan teaches including re-establishing traffic channel for the communication device (see page 1, section [0008]).

Regarding claims 7, 17, 27 and 37, Aravamudan teaches including re-establishing traffic channel for the communication device simultaneously with the sending the request (see page 4, session [0053]).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 4-5, 14-15, 24-25 and 34-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aravamudan (U.S. Pub. No. 20030148779) in view of Diep (U.S. Pub No. 20030048764).

Regarding claims 4, 14, 24 and 34, Aravamudan fails to teach the transmitting the request on a reverse access channel (R-ACH) of a wireless network.

However, Diep teaches the transmitting the request on a reverse access channel (R-ACH) of a wireless network (see page 5, table 8 and session [0047]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify Aravamudan system and by providing of the teaching of Diep on the reverse link access channel, thereto in order to provide user wants to become a talker may request the reverse traffic channel by sending this message to the base station.

Regarding claims 5, 15, 25 and 35, Aravamudan fails to teach the transmitting the request on a reverse enhanced access channel (R-EACH) of a wireless network.

However, Diep teaches the transmitting the request on a reverse enhanced access channel (R-EACH) of a wireless network (see fig. 4, page 4, table 7 and session [0044]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify Aravamudan system and by providing of the teaching of Diep on the reverse enhanced access channel, thereto in order to provide user to share signaling channel for forward link.

5. Claims 8-10, 18-20, 28-30 and 38-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aravamudan (U.S. Pub. No. 20030148779) in view of Wang (U.S. Pub No. 20020055364).

Regarding claims 8, 18, 28 and 38, Aravamudan fails to teach the renegotiating a radio link protocol (RLP) for the communication device.

However, Wang teaches the renegotiating a radio link protocol (RLP) for the communication device (see page 3, session [0034]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify Aravamudan system and by providing of the teaching of Wang on the radio link protocol (RLP) initialization process, thereto in order to provide user with packet data service call control function enters the connection state easier.

Art Unit: 2684

Regarding claims 9, 19, 29 and 39, Aravamudan fails to teach the renegotiating a radio link protocol (RLP) for the communication device simultaneously with the sending the request.

However, Wang teaches the renegotiating a radio link protocol (RLP) for the communication device simultaneously with the sending the request (see page 3, session [0034-0035]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify Aravamudan system and by providing of the teaching of Wang on the radio link protocol (RLP) initialization process, thereto in order to provide user with packet data service call control function and request reverse high speed operation easier.

Regarding claims 10, 20, 30 and 40, Aravamudan fails to teach the transmitting the request in short data burst (SDB) form.

However, Wang teaches the request in short data burst (SDB) form (see page 4, session [0053]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify Aravamudan system and by providing of the teaching of Wang on the short data burst (SDB), thereto in order to provide user to send the short data burst message or SMS message easier.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 3-21-2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Art Unit: 2684

Applicant argues that the reference of Aravamudan (U.S. Pub. No. 20030148779) fails to disclose a member list is received from a user, and the user have multiple group call listed on the user's handset and the list is set or already residing on the handset. However, the examiner does not agree, since Aravamudan teaches a user have multiple group call listed on the user's handset, e.g., a soccer club group and card playing group, that is the member list was received, and user have to stored in the handset. To choose a group, the user scrolls down through the list of groups, select a particular group, and send request to initiation of the group call (see page 7, section [0085]). Therefore the reference of Aravamudan is teaching the limitation discussed above.

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

8. **Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Art Unit: 2684

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(571) 273-8300, (for Technology Center 2600 only)

*Hand-delivered responses should be brought to the Customer Service Window (now located at the **Randolph Building, 401 Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA 22314**).*

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tan Trinh whose telephone number is (571) 272-7888. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:30 AM to 6:00 PM.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nay Maung, can be reached at (571) 272-7882.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the **Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office** whose telephone number is **(703) 306-0377**.

Art Unit: 2684

10. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Tan H. Trinh 
Art Unit 2684
June 29, 2005


NAY MAUNG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER